



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,282	12/22/2005	Christianus Hermanus Leopold Weijtens	DE030223	5688
24737	7590	04/17/2008		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS				
P.O. BOX 3001				
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
PIZIALI, JEFFREY J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/562,282

Applicant(s)WEIJTENS, CHRISTIANUS
HERMANUS LEOPOLD**Examiner**

Jeff Piziali

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/22/05 & 12/28/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. At least Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated (see Page 4, Lines 1-2 of the specification). See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the figures.

Specification

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to at least because:

The term, "***the usually $N \times M$ external contacts***" should be changed, for example to, "***the usual $N \times M$ external contacts***" (see line 10).

The term, "***into display unit***" should be changed, for example to, "***into a display unit***" (see line 15).

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

5. The disclosure is objected to because of at least the following informalities:

The term, "***a 'abcdabcd'***" should be changed, for example to, "***an 'abcdabcd'***" (see page 11, line 17).

The term, "***in total independently***" should be changed, for example to, "***in total independent***" (see page 12, line 4).

Appropriate correction is required.

6. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*an integrated display unit*" (in line 1). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the "*display unit*" is "*integrated*" with.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*a plurality of display elements*" (in line 2); "*display elements*" (in line 8); and "*display elements*" (in line 15). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each instance of "*display elements*" refers to the same shared set of "*display elements*"; or rather whether each instance of "*display elements*" refers to a separate and distinct set of "*display elements*".

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*a plurality of switches*" (in line 4); "*the first, third, fifth, etc. switch*" (in line 11); and "*the second, fourth, sixth, etc. switch*" (in line 13). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each instance of a numbered "*switch*" is a shared and common element of the "*plurality*

Art Unit: 2629

of switches"; or rather whether each instance of a numbered *"switch"* refers to a separate and distinct *"switch"* from the *"plurality of switches"* and each other.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: *"which can be closed... and opened"* (in line 5). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of this limitation is meant to be.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: *"and with"* (in line 6). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of this limitation is meant to be.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: *"a plurality of inverters"* (in line 6); *"inverters"* (in line 6); and *"an inverter"* (in line 8). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each *"inverter(s)"* instance refers to the same shared set of *"inverters"*; or rather whether each *"inverter(s)"* instance refers respectively to a separate and distinct individual or set of *"inverter(s)"*.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: *"mutual alternation"* (in line 7). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of this limitation is meant to be.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: *"each"* (in line 9). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of this limitation is meant to be.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: *"at least one clock bus line ($\Phi 1$, $\Phi 2$)"* (in line 10). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether this limitation is limited to one, two, or more *"clock bus line(s)"*.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*via which*" (in line 10). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of this limitation is meant to be.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*the first*" (in line 10). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of this limitation is meant to be. The "*first*" what?

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*the second*" (in line 12). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of this limitation is meant to be. The "*second*" what?

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*consecutively*" (in line 14). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of this limitation is meant to be.

10. Regarding claim 1, the ellipsis punctuation mark "..." (e.g., see lines 5, 6, 9, 11, and 13) renders the claim indefinite because the claim includes elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "..."), thereby rendering the scope of the claim unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.

11. Regarding claim 1, the abbreviated Latin et cetera expression "*etc.*" (e.g., see lines 11 and 13) renders the claim indefinite because the claim includes elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "*etc.*"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.

12. Claim 1 recites the limitations: "*the first, third, fifth, etc. switch*" (in line 11); "*the series arrangement*" (in line 12); "*the second, fourth, sixth, etc. switch*" (in line 13); "*the application*" (in line 13); and "*the input*" (in line 14). There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

13. Claims 2-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*an integrated display unit*" (in line 1). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the "*display unit*" is "*integrated*" with. Furthermore, it would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each dependent claim's recitation of "*an integrated display unit*" is identical to the "*integrated display unit*" of independent claim 1; or rather whether each dependent claim's recitation of "*an integrated display unit*" is somehow separate and distinct from the "*integrated display unit*" of independent claim 1.

14. Claim 2 recites the limitations: "*the form*" (in line 2) and "*the edge*" (in line 3). There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

15. Regarding claim 4, the ellipsis punctuation mark "..." (e.g., see line 2) renders the claim indefinite because the claim includes elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "..."), thereby rendering the scope of the claim unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.

16. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*an n-transistor*" (in line 2) and "*an n-transistor*" (in line 3). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each instance of "*an n-transistor*" refers to an identical "*n-transistor*"; or rather whether each instance of "*an n-transistor*" refers to a separate and distinct "*n-transistor*".

17. Claim 5 recites the limitation: "*the non-interlaced control*" (in line 3). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

18. Regarding claim 5, the abbreviated Latin et cetera expression "*etc.*" (e.g., see line 3) renders the claim indefinite because the claim includes elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "*etc.*"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.

19. Regarding claim 5, the ellipsis punctuation mark "..." (e.g., see line 3) renders the claim indefinite because the claim includes elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "..."), thereby rendering the scope of the claim unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.

20. Claim 6 recites the limitation: "***the sampled rows or sampled columns***" (in line 2). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

21. Claim 7 recites the limitations: "***the interlaced control***" (in line 2); "***the half-image switch-over***" (in line 3); "***the converters***" (in line 4); and "***the input***" (in line 5). There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

22. Regarding claim 7, the ellipsis punctuation mark "..." (e.g., see lines 3, 4, and 5) renders the claim indefinite because the claim includes elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "..."), thereby rendering the scope of the claim unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.

23. Regarding claim 8, the ellipsis punctuation mark "..." (e.g., see line 2) renders the claim indefinite because the claim includes elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "..."), thereby rendering the scope of the claim unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.

Art Unit: 2629

24. Claim 7 recites the limitations: "*the sampled rows*" (in line 2); "*the sampled scanning columns*" (in line 2); "*the data rows*" (in lines 2-3); and "*the data columns*" (in line 3). There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The documents listed on the attached '*Notice of References Cited*' are cited to further evidence the state of the art pertaining to integrated display units.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-7678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeff Piziali/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2629
11 April 2008